

## REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are currently pending. Claims 1, 9, and 14-18 have been amended.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 9, 10, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0021283 A1, application no. 09/934,739, (Rosenberg).

Rosenberg discloses an object interaction expression apparatus for expressing interactions between plural objects that move by simulation in a virtual space. According to Rosenberg, Rosenberg's invention is directed to controlling and providing force feedback to a user operating a human/computer interface device in conjunction with a simulated environment implemented by a host computer system. See Rosenberg, page 2, paragraph [0010]. The user views graphical images on a display while feeling realistic force sensations using safe, practical force feedback devices such that the user is involved in an immersive and intuitive simulation.

In contrast, as described in the present application, at page 2, section 2, the present invention provides apparatuses for expressing interaction between plural objects that move by simulation in a virtual space and providing expressed interactions for the user, wherein the present invention stores in a correlated form, an interaction magnitude of an object and a corresponding expression mode in which the interaction magnitude will be expressed, calculates interaction magnitudes of objects that interact with each other, controls an expression of the interaction magnitude of the objects that interact with each other based on the expression mode stored corresponding to the interaction magnitude calculated and provides controlled expression of the interaction magnitude of the objects for the user.

Rosenberg fails to disclose an expression of the interaction magnitude of the objects associated with a corresponding expression mode. That is, the present invention is distinct from Rosenberg in that the present invention stores, calculates controls, and provides the interaction magnitude of the objects associated with the corresponding expression mode for the user, whereby the user accurately quantitatively tells the interaction magnitude of the objects as described in an embodiment of the present invention.

Accordingly, claims 1, 9, and 14 are patentable over Rosenberg. As claims 2, 10, and 15 are dependent on claims 1, 9, and 14, respectively, the present claims 2, 10, and 15 are also patentable over Rosenberg.

Claims 3, 4, 11, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Tarr.

As Tarr fails to cure the deficiencies of Rosenberg, claims 3, 4, 11, and 16, via respective independent claims 1, 9, and 14, are patentable over the cited combination of references. Claims 5, 6, 12, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Gagne.

As Gagne fails to cure the deficiencies of Rosenberg, claims 5, 6, 12, and 17, via respective claims 1, 9, and 14, claims 5, 6, 12, and 17 are patentable over the cited combination of references.

Claims 7, 8, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg and Tarr in view of Gagne. Gagne fails to cure the deficiencies of Rosenberg and Tarr. Therefore, claims 7, 8, and 18, via respective claims 1 and 14, are patentable over the references.

Claims 7, 8, 13, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg and Tarr, in view of Pryor. As Pryor fails to cure the deficiencies of Rosenberg and Tarr, claims 7, 8, 13, and 18, via respective independent claims, are patentable over the cited combination of references.

On page 8 of the Office Action, claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 due to the claimed invention being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claim 9 to recite, "providing controlled expression of the interaction magnitude of the objects for the user," in accordance with the Examiner's comments.

Applicants have amended claims 14-18 to recite a computer-readable medium. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/774,593

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/6/07

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas

Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501